The doctrine held not to apply in case of a boiler explosion.

Where the employe made the specific allegation that failure to brace certain posts was the cause of a traveling crane falling on him, the doctrine did not apply.

The doctrine was applied in an action to recover for the death of a locomotive engineer, who was killed when his engine was derailed by running into an open switch.

The pulling out of a draw-bar of a freight train affords a proper basis for the application of the doctrine.

The want of man power in England calls attention to the necessity of dispensing, as far as possible, with the services of jurors during the war, and the Attorney-General has announced that some action may be taken in reference to Grand Juries, owing to the fact that in these days magisterial investigations are so much more thorough than they used to be, that neither Grand juries nor Coroners juries are as importan tor so indispensable as they used to be. Whilst we think it would be a misfortune to do away with the jury system, we can well afford at the present time to dispense with the services of men who would be better employed on their farms, or in munition factories, unless indeed they are eligible for military service and if so they ought to be enlisted.

As we learn from *Law Notes*, a somewhat unique libel suit has recently been determined in New York, wherein a well-known magistrate recovered a verdict of $35,000 from the publishers of a popular novel on proof that a character, somewhat unattractively portrayed therein, was intended to represent him: (*Corrigan* v. *Bobbs-Merrill Co.*, 158 N.Y.S. 85). This case will doubtless go to appeal. The difficulty in such a case is not so much the law as the difficulty of proving the allegations.